

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

Examiner interview

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended to applicant's representative during the personal interview conducted with the examiner on March 28, 2007.

During the interview, applicant's representative pointed out differences between the claimed invention and the Bodmer reference. In particular, it was pointed out that in the present invention, each of the mold series have first and second mold parts wherein the first mold parts are differently shaped from the second mold parts.

The examiner noted that, while the claims recite first and second mold impressions, and first and second mold parts, the claims do not specify that the first and second are differently shaped from one another. According to the examiner's construction, since Bodmer shows two mold cavities on each row of the half-mold 6, these could be construed as "first and second" even though they are not different.

It was suggested that claim 1 be modified to more clearly state that the first and second elements are differently shaped from one another. It was agreed that, with such an amendment, Bodmer would no longer anticipate the present invention.

Additionally, the rejection under 353 USC 112 was discussed. It was agreed that simply eliminating the recitation of "each time" and substituting, for example, "when" would overcome this rejection, since it is clear that the recited formation of injection molding pieces occurs when the first or second series of mold parts works in conjunction with the third series of mold parts.

In the claims

Claim 1 is amended to clarify that the first and second mold impressions have a different shape from one another. Similarly, the first and second mold parts have a different shape from one another. Support for this amendment is found in the specification at least at lines 14-23 of page 10, lines 12-18 of page 12, lines 12-20 of page 13, and in Figures 2-6.

Claim 1 is also amended to recite that first and second injection molding pieces are formed when the first or second series of mold parts works in conjunction with the third series, rather than "each time" as previously recited.

Rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-16 presently stand rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the examiner states that "there is no support in the original specification for the added limitation that 'each time the first or second series of mold parts works in conjunction with the third series of mold parts', a first injection piece and a second injection piece is formed.

Claim 1 has been amended, as noted above, to replace the phrase "each time the first or second series" with the phrase "when the first or second series."

It is respectfully submitted that it is clear throughout the original specification that the present invention provides both first and second mold parts on each of the mold series so that when either of the first and second series works in conjunction with the third series both first and second injection molding pieces are formed, as can be seen in Fig. 3.

In view of this amendment, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Rejection of claims 1-3 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 14-16 presently stand rejected as being anticipated by Bodmer et al (U.S. 6,783,346). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, claim 1 is amended to clarify that first and second mold parts each have a different shape from one another, and the first and second mold impressions each have a different shape from one another.

Since each series of mold parts has first and second mold parts, and the first and second mold parts have a different shape, each time the first or second series of mold parts works in conjunction with the third series first and second injection molding parts are formed according to the differently shaped first and second impressions.

Bodmer differs from the presently claimed invention because Bodmer does not function such that at least one first injection molding piece (according to a first mold impression) *and* at least one second injection molding piece (according to a second mold impression having a different shape from the first) is formed each time the *first or second series* of mold parts works in conjunction with the third series of mold parts.

Bodmer teaches, to the contrary, that “the individual material or color components are not manufactured in one plane [...], but rather manufactured in a tool with several levels (parting planes)” (*Bodmer*; col. 2, lines 31-35). It follows from this passage (and is clear from Bodmer’s figures) that the mold according to Bodmer is designed to manufacture molding pieces having a first shape in a first parting plane (between the first outer mold part and one of the central series of mold parts), and to manufacture second mold pieces in a second parting plane (between the second outer mold part and the another of the central series of mold parts).

More particularly, referring to Bodmer’s Fig. 2 it can be seen that half-mold 6 is provided with mold cavities 20. There is no teaching or suggestion that any of the mold cavities 20 on the half mold 6 are differently shaped from one another. Instead, the half-molds 10 and 11 (the rotating, centrally located pair of half-molds) “are each implemented as double” (*Bodmer*; col. 6, lines 42-43).

Referring to Fig. 3, it can be understood that this means that the central half-molds 10 and 11 are provided with mold cavities 21.1 and 21.2. One type of the mold cavities

(21.1 or 21.2) corresponds to the mold cavities on one of the half-molds 3, 6, while the other type of mold cavity corresponds to the other half-mold 3, 6.

Thus, when for example the half-mold 6 mates with one of the central half-molds 10, 11, only a single type (shape) of article is formed. Slides 22 provided on the third and forth (central) half-molds 10, 11 are provided "which serve for moving articles made of a first material component into a further one, [...] so that the articles can be injection molded around on several sides" (*Bodmer*; col. 5, lines 62-66). "The movement of the slides is designed such that the articles are moved out of the first cavity, displaced and placed inside a second cavity" (*Bodmer*; col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 1).

More precisely, with reference to Figs. 2 and 3, "articles 25 by means of the slide 22 are transferred out of a first to a second half-cavity 21.1, 21.2" (*Bodmer*; col. 6, lines 48-49). Referring to the arrangement of the half-cavities "implemented as double" on the half-mold 10 (as seen in Figs 2 and 3), and the corresponding half cavities 20 of half-mold 6, it can be seen that only one type of the half-cavities 21.1 and 21.2 of the half-mold 10 are aligned with the half-cavities 20 of the half-mold 6.

It can therefore be understood that only a single article type or shape is formed by interaction of the half-mold 6 with one of the central half-molds 10, 11.

Bodmer does not teach or suggest a mold with at least three series of mold parts, namely a first series, a second series and a third series respectively, wherein every series has at least one first mold part which can form a wall for a first mold impression when forming a first injection molding piece, as well as at least one second mold part *having a different shape* than the first mold part and which can form a wall for a second mold impression when forming a second injection molding piece.

Therefore, Bodmer does not anticipate claims 1-3 and 14-16, and therefore claims 1-3 and 14-16 are allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Rejection of claims 4-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4 and 6 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over Bodmer in view of Boucherie (U.S. 6,379,139) (hereafter Boucherie '139). Claim 5 is rejected as being unpatentable over Bodmer and Boucherie '139 in view of Boucherie (EP 678 368) (hereafter Boucherie '368), and claims 7-11 are rejected as being unpatentable over Bodmer in view of Boucherie. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Each of claims 4-11 and 13 depend from claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Bodmer because Bodmer fails to disclose or suggest each and every element set forth in claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that neither Boucherie '139 nor Boucherie '368 supplement the deficiencies of Bodmer with respect to the elements set forth in claim 1, and therefore neither Bodmer in view of Boucherie '139 nor Bodmer in view of Boucherie '368 form a prima facie case of obviousness of any of the dependent claims 4-11. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4-11 are allowable over the cited references, and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1-16 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

Application No.: 10/693,983

Examiner: M. A. Huson

Art Unit: 1732

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 9, 2007

/John R. Schaefer, Reg. #47,921/
John R. Schaefer